DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 881 JC 760 641

AUTHOR McIntyre, Catherine E.; Wales, Christy A.
TITLE Evaluation of a Non-Traditional College: Costs and Effectiveness.
INSTITUTION Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Seattle. Research and Planning Office.
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 76p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Role; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Cost Effectiveness; *Delivery Systems; Educational Accountability; Educational Facilities; Evaluation; *Expenditure Per Student; Experimental Colleges; *Junior Colleges; Objectives; Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Noncampus Colleges; *Whatcom Community College

ABSTRACT

This document compares the operating effectiveness and costs associated with Whatcom Community College (WCC), a non-campus educational system, to estimated alternative costs of a traditional campus operation for WCC. Comparative data were obtained by using three other colleges as proxy institutions for a hypothetical campus-based WCC. Among the findings of the evaluation were: (1) WCC without a campus performed at least as well as a WCC with a campus in meeting the majority of its operating goals; (2) WCC without a campus did no better than its counterpart at assessing and meeting the needs of target groups; (3) educational services were adequately provided without a campus; (4) WCC without a campus spent 10% less per student and 6% less per course; and (5) one-third less in instructional costs per student was spent in the non-campus operation. Overall, WCC without a campus appeared to be doing at least as well as the average performance of other campus-based colleges. Appended are three WCC documents entitled: (1) WCC Looks at First Six Years; (2) Internal Mandates; and (3) How a College Without a Campus Plans to House its Services. Also appended are tabular data used in the study. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131881

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF A NON-TRADITIONAL COLLEGE:

COSTS AND EFFECTIVENESS

Catherine E. McIntyre
Christy A. Wales
October 15, 1976

Research & Planning Office
WASHINGTON STATE BOARD for
COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION
115 N. 85th Street
Suite 200
Seattle, Washington 98103

JE 760 641

0.0 Summary

0.1 Purpose: To provide data to the Whatcom Demonstration Project Committee regarding:

0.1.1 The effectiveness of the demonstration project in meeting Whatcom Community College's eight objectives (Section 2.1)

0.1.2 Comparative costs for demonstration project vs. "traditional" campus-based college (Section 4.0)

0.1.3 Estimates of future costs and benefits (Section 5.0)

0.2 Three "proxy" colleges were selected (Section 3.2) making up WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. Data collected via phone (Appendix II), and from MIS reports and college operating budgets for hypothetical WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS was compared to data from the demonstration project, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS (Section 4.2)

0.3 Findings:

0.3.1 On six of eight goals WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS has performed at least as well as WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS (Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.6 and 4.3.7)

0.3.2 WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS did as well as WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS in serving its target groups. R&PO expected the demonstration project to perform significantly better than campus-based colleges; it did not (Sections 4.3.4 and 4.4)

0.3.3 WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS provides all educational services except some student activities without a central campus. Judgements as to how convenient are the locations where services are provided cannot be made because no formal geographical needs assessment has been made (Section 4.3.5)

0.3.4 Total operating costs for the alternative approaches are as follows: (Section 4.5 and Table I)

0.3.4.1 Cost/FTE: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS 26% higher

0.3.4.2 Cost/Course: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS 6% lower

0.3.4.3 Cost/Student:* WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS 10% lower

0.3.5 Total capital investment cost to build a campus for Whatcom Community College (based on 1974 to 1982 design-construction schedule) is $9,970,000 (Section 3.4.3)

* *Unduplicated, annualized headcount.*

0.3.6 A trend emerged from data for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS indicating:

0.3.6.1 that student enrollment in off-campus, evening classes is increasing (Section 4.3.5)

0.3.6.2 and that part-time student enrollment (academic and occupational) is increasing (to 63% in Spring 1975)

0.4 Conclusions:

0.4.1 The Whatcom demonstration project was at least as effective as traditional approaches.

0.4.2 That the demonstration project costs more per FTE but less per course and per student (unduplicated, annualized headcount) than a campus-based operation.

0.5 Recommendations:

0.5.1 FTE students will become less and less a representative figure for community colleges such as the four analyzed in this study (Section 0.3.6 above)

0.5.2 Since Whatcom serves over 80% part-time students, and these are specifically students it seeks to serve, it is unfair to base Whatcom's funding on a strictly FTE basis (Section 5.3, 5.4)

0.5.3 On a temporary basis the SBCCE should modify FTE-based funding for WCC toward parity (on a cost/student basis) with WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS funding.

0.5.4 In the long run, the SBCCE should consider a complex formula including cost/student and/or cost/course with cost/FTE student.

0.5.5 Even if recommended adjustments are made to Whatcom Community College's budget (Section 0.5.3 and 0.5.4), it would still be far cheaper to pay these higher operating costs than to build a campus for Whatcom Community College (Section 0.3.5 and Appendix).

WHATCOM DEMONSTRATION PROJECT EVALUATION

1.0 As part of its demonstration of a unique, non-campus educational system, funded by the state legislature and Kellogg Foundation, Whatcom Community College sought to determine:

a. to what extent the demonstration was an effective means of delivery of educational services, and
b. what cost factors and accomodations would be necessary to relate the funding of this style of operation to that of traditional operations.

With these two missions an advisory committee was established in 1975 whose members represent four community colleges, including Whatcom, and the State Board for Community College Education.

1.2 In March 1976, at Whatcom's request, the Research and Planning office (R&PO) of the State Board presented a preliminary evaluation plan to the Whatcom Demonstration Project committee. The committee agreed that it should pursue the possibility of using the R&PO to provide an evaluation model and to collect the data, with this information to be submitted to the State Board in September 1976. After further discussions with the State Board and Whatcom Community College to refine their evaluation plan, the R&PO presented a revised plan to the Whatcom Demonstration committee in April 1976.

1.3 The accepted plan provided for a five-step analysis:

a. identify objectives of the decision makers.
b. identify the alternative means of obtaining the objectives.
c. determine the costs of the alternatives.
d. develop a model to predict future costs and benefits.
e. provide a criterion for ranking alternatives.

1.4 This report is the result of that analysis. Section 2.0 identifies the sorts of answers sought by the SBCCE Demonstration Project Committee, most of which are suggested above. Section 3.0 identifies the alternative means of obtaining the objectives and identifies the expected outcomes of the two alternatives considered: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS, a traditional system and WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS, the non-traditional educational delivery system which Whatcom Community College has attempted to manifest through the demonstration project. Section 4.0 will outline the costs of the two alternatives, assessing both the costs expressed in degree of effectiveness and costs in terms of comparative dollars spent. Section 5.0 presents R&PO's model of the future costs and benefits implied by the data they analyzed. The final section, Section 6.0, relates the comparison of the costs of alternatives to the criterion established by the Demonstration Project Committee in its April 27 meeting: "that the alternative which most fully meets all the Whatcom Community College objectives would be considered the better alternative."

2.0 Objectives

2.1 Determine Effectiveness

The Whatcom Demonstration Project Committee and Whatcom Community College were most concerned with assessing the effectiveness of its non-campus delivery system. Effectiveness is measured by:

a. Examining the general goals of a system.
b. Translating the goals into quantitative, measureable desired outcomes.
c. Gathering outcome and related information.
d. Analyzing that information to describe actual outcomes.
e. Comparing actual with desired outcomes, explaining variance and predicting future performance.

The goals of Whatcom Community College were established at its inception by the Whatcon Community College Board of Trustees in their formulation of "Internal Mandates." From the internal mandates, eight objectives have been delineated by Whatcom.[1/] The eight objectives are as follows:

a. To provide both preparatory and supplementary training in any occupational field requested and not readily available from other institutions in Whatcom County.
b. To provide general educational requirements and an A.A. degree program that will transfer to four year institutions.
c. To provide opportunities for individuals interested in avocational (course work for pleasure), exploratory and developmental (improving skills) education.
d. To provide significant supplementary educational services to meet the identified needs of the following target populations:

    1. the unemployed and underemployed needing vocational skills
    2. the migrant and seasonal workers
    3. veterans
    4. native Americans
    5. the elderly (65 years or older)
    6. the late starter - potential transfer students who did not include college entrance requirements among their high school goals
    7. the wage earner whose search for cultural enrichment must be undertaken at other than regular work-week hours
    8. women who are 18 years or older or who have graduated from high school who are in the previous categories or simply questioning the relevance of further education to them

1/ *The process of specifically translating the mandates into quantitative, measurable desired outcomes has been implemented at Whatcom through an Institutional Evaluation Plan (IEP) developed by Whatcom with the assistance of Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory of Portland, Oregon.*

e. To provide all of WCC's educational services in locations as convenient as possible to the students and without establishment of a central campus.
f. To develop and implement a long-range plan (6 years) and a systematic planning and evaluation process.
g. To conduct WCC's operation cooperatively and in coordination with other existing educational agencies rather than in competition with them.
h. To select and train staff whose qualifications are appropriate and consistent with the mission and goals of the college.

The preceding set of objectives, particularly d and e, corresponds to an approach to education which developed in the last ten years, loosely identified as external degree programs. The strategies of external degree programs have included individualized instruction and student evaluation, and interdisciplinary programs provided outside an "8 to 5" schedule on a non-residential basis.[2/] Thus, the demonstration project was in some sense an experiment, and both Whatcom Community College and the State Board require a review or summary of what the experiment has demonstrated.

2.2 Cost of Providing Non-Campus Education

2.2.1 When Whatcom Community College committed itself to providing education to a broad range of students in an unprecedented non-residential mode, little data on the financial cost of such an operation were available. One of the "selling points" of Whatcom's proposed demonstration was an argument found in start-up activities for all external degree programs with which R&PO is familiar: that without the high capital investment of a campus, costs of education will be much lower. Such arguments are often tempered by recognition of the high cost of program development. Many external degree programs began only shortly before Whatcom Community College's demonstration project; therefore, actual dollar cost determined from analysis of experience were at best "guesstimates." Now data from Whatcom is in. Our study attempts to summarize that information so that Whatcom's operation during the demonstration period can provide a basis on which future financial decisions can be made.

2/ Examples of other educational systems operating under similar models is presented in Section 2.0. See also: Report of a Conference on Non-Traditional Higher Education, Vermont Regional Community College Commission, Inc., 1973; and State of Washington, Council on Higher Education (Draft) External Degree Programs: A Review, November, 1972.

2.2.2 We hope by assessing the effectiveness and the costs of the Whatcom Demonstration Project to provide Whatcom Community College with crucial feedback to the energy and creativity its staff have committed to Whatcom's desired outcomes; to provide the SBCCE with data which should be considered in committing funds to extension for all community colleges in its system; and to provide to Washington's community colleges (and colleges and universities nationwide) some alternatives with which they might respond to emerging educational needs.

3.0 Alternative Means

3.1 In evaluating the WCC Demonstration Project, the R&PO had first to determine standards against which to assess the effectiveness of the Demonstration Project. Since the project is unique, there are no other projects with which to compare it "across the board." Similar approaches to education are so new as to have produced little information on cost and effectiveness. One could make guesses as to how well Whatcom's operations under the Demonstration Project should have done for how many dollars. However, even "best guess" standards would produce comparisons which are too ambiguous a basis upon which to make the timely policy decisions necessary. Therefore, R&PO determined that the most realistic evaluation should compare Whatcom's demonstration, hereinafter referred to as WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS, with how Whatcom might perform as a traditional community college, e.g. WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS.

3.2 Performance of the latter would be analyzed by combining data from existing community colleges whose service area has similar characteristics (i.e. rural, sparsely populated with only one small population center). R&PO surveyed the 27 community colleges in Washington state with these characteristics in mind. In addition, we compared community college budgets for 1973-74, 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 by program area. Colleges whose patterns of funding by program area more closely matched Whatcom's were determined. Finally, correlations were computed which indicated how closely the patterns of FTE's in each discipline (by HEGIS Institutional Intent Categories) for each of the 26 other colleges matched the pattern for Whatcom (Fall 1975). Appendix 1, Part A shows the configuration for budget program areas; Part B shows the correlations of FTE's by HEGIS categories). R&PO presented its analysis to the WDP Committee who selected on the basis of R&PO's calculations and its knowledge of demographic similarities between community colleges, three community colleges who would make up a "proxy" for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. Combined data from three colleges would minimize the differences between Whatcom's operations and those of any one other community college, and would maximize the similarities which campus based operations share.

3.3 What are the differences one would expect from the Demonstration Project compared to a campus-based community college? What theoretical assumptions are implicit in the innovations built into the design of the demonstration project?

3.4 What the demonstration project seeks to depart from is a traditional, campus-based model. WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS is hypothetical; but if it existed, at the "traditional" endpoint of a traditional-non-traditional continuum, it would exhibit the following configuration:

3.4.1 WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS emphasizes service to a core of 18-22 year old students, offering the majority of its classes in college classrooms during the day. Average student course loads are about 15 hours per quarter.[3/] Most courses offered are either academic or occupational. Students in academic courses attend WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS rather than a four-year college because of lower tuition, geographic proximity (so that students need not reside on campus and therefore save room and board costs), smaller student body (making the transition from high school social life less drastic), or/and because of enrollment restrictions at the four-year institutions. Occupational students attend the community college because other vocational-technical training is not available to them because of cost, lack of openings in craft/trade apprenticeship programs or simply because no other training agency exists within commuting distance.

3.4.2 WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS has a campus because colleges and universities traditionally have a campus. Assumptions behind the tradition appear to be that defining a physical area as different from its surroundings emphasizes a functional difference between the activities which occur within that area and those in the environment outside. The inside-outside difference is marked by architectural uniformity within a park-like setting creating a planned atmosphere of quiet order in constrast to the noisy, distracting jumble outside. The campus thus has a particular identity to which faculty, students and staff can relate. The faculty represent an enclave of learned specialists who communicate their rational knowledge to students. Students integrate classroom learning with informal, directed experience from student activities such as athletics and student government.

3/ Wide use of the measure FTE students by the community college system for policy decisions indicates that a full-time student is assumed to be the principal client of community colleges. FTE students is a measure which is "recommended as the standard for reporting and exchange of information" by National Center for Higher Education. Management Systems (NCHEMS at WICHE, Statewide Measures Inventory: Measure Number 5100, January 1975).

3.4.3 All these activities take place in a 75-acre site with buildings providing a minimum of:

7,000 sq. feet of general classroom space;
4,700 sq. feet of science laboratories:
10,000 sq. feet of faculty and administrative offices;
11,000 sq. feet of library/learning resource area; and
10,000 sq. feet of dining, lounge and student activity space[4/]

Capital investment (including fixed equipment costs) for the initial phase of WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS as described above is $3.1 million. A later phase (in a four-phase design-construction plan) will provide 22,000 sq. feet, for 1100 FTE (800 on-campus) students, divided as follows:

2,000 sq. feet of additional faculty and administrative offices;
15,000 sq. feet of vocational training facilities; and
5,000 sq. feet of fine arts area

for an additional $2,060,000 (total for Phase I and II = $5,160,000.)[5/]

3.4.4 For(non-hypothetical) WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS, there are practical as well as theoretical reasons why Whatcom Community College sought to depart from a traditional campus-based approach. The practical reality is that two post-secondary educational facilities already serve Whatcom County: Bellingham Vocational-Technical Institute which elected not to join the community college system in 1967, and Western Washington State College (which occupies a 200 acre campus). Both are located in Bellingham at the south-west corner of Whatcom County. Partly for this reason, Whatcom Community College's organizers elected to create an alternate form of education for students who are geographically or/and socially remote from BVTI or Western. Like Minnesota Metropolitan State College, a similar external degree approach, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS would be "a college for those who do not have a college."[6/]

4/ *Estimate of Assignable Square Feet for Occupancy in Sept. 1974 (for beginning student enrollment of 600 FTE (400 on-campus day students) provided by Bill Julius, SBCCE Capital Budget Officer, May 1976.*

5/ *Ibid. Total estimated cost for completion of Phase I through IV of WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS in September 1982 = $9,970,000.*

6/ *Op. Cit., Minnesota Metropolitan State College, Prospectus II, November 1971, p.9.*

3.4.5 "Socially remote" describes a new type of student. Persons who desire education but who work or maintain a home full-time are limited in attaining educational goals by time as well as place. To pursue their training, they need education at times and places other than those used by full-time students. By definition these students will have to be part-time. Also, socially remote from the typical college student are older students who have had more experience, and many students from minority groups and low-income homes. All these are types of students who bring special aspirations and handicaps that require more flexible and individualized programs.

3.4.6 Flexibility in programming involves innovative approaches in three areas of education: time and location, faculty and types of instruction. Coordinating the three areas may also involve a non-traditional administrative structure.

3.4.7 Flexibility in time and location means that classes must be offered in many places with a good selection of classes scheduled in late afternoon and evening hours. Therefore, an evening class may be offered at a community high school; however, it could also be offered in a home, a church, an office or a shop. Not only does this increase the accessibility of education to students who must study part-time, but it eliminates expensive duplication of facilities, and teaches students how to utilize the existing facilities of their communities.

3.4.8 One mode of making faculty assignments more responsive to the needs of the "new student" is to abandon the traditional enclave of full-time professional faculty. Instead, a distinction is made between "core faculty" and "community faculty."1/

3.4.9 Core faculty are a small group of full-time professionals who serve as educational brokers assisting students in matching up their interests and needs with the proper mix of educational resources (community faculty, facilities and programs) available through the college. Community faculty are local, experienced practitioners, often non-educators, who assist the student in learning specific skills.

3.4.10 Types of instruction which will most effectively meet the educational needs of the "new student" include more individualized programs, (learning contracts, self-paced learning packages, etc.), specialized equipment for delivery of laboratory classes in remote locations, and courses which integrate classroom and field experience.

1/ *This is an approach used by Minnesota Metropolitan State College, Empire State College (New York) and the Community College of Vermont.*

3.4.11 Innovations in one area supplement and expand the possibilities in others. (i.e., the combination of workplace as classroom, community faculty and integrated work experience). As stated in the Carnegie Commission report, Less Time, More Options:

> We have learned some things about the educational process. One is that experience outside the classroom can actually benefit classroom performance and make it more meaningful...A second is that it may be hazardous to have a student caste too separated from the realities of the world at work, too immune to the practicalities of actual accomplishments, too removed from contact with their fellow citizens -- a class apart. (pp. 9-10)

3.4.12 This section has outlined the differences between a hypothetical traditional community college, WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS, and an alternative to it, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. As will be seen below, data from the three proxy community colleges who make up WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS diverge from the traditional community college sketched above. But WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is designed to be far more non-traditional.

4.0 Cost of Alternatives

4.1 This section compares the effectiveness of WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS to that of WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS in meeting Whatcom Community College's objectives. Then it compares dollar expenditures by program area for the traditional against the non-traditional model.

4.2 R&PO collected data for Whatcom's operations for 1975-76 and for the proxy colleges who make up WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS for 1974-75. Different academic years were analyzed for three reasons:

4.2.1 Data for 1975-76 community college operations was not available until after June 1976. While it would have been possible to wait for data from all four colleges, R&PO chose to gather the data already available on the proxy colleges and to wait for 1975-76 data only for Whatcom.

4.2.2 The amount of state funds per FTE student allocated to Whatcom Community College for 1975-76 matches the average amount per FTE allocated to the three proxy colleges for 1974-75 better than for 1975-76.

4.2.3 1974-75 was a start-up year for the demonstration project. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS was therefore more fully implemented in 1975-76, making 1975-76 data more representative of demonstration effectiveness and cost.

4.3 Effectiveness.

R&PO's analysis of the effectiveness of WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is provided in the following format:

Each goal is stated, specific evaluative questions relating to attainment of the goal are listed, a pre-determined range of possible answers is listed, and the actual answers determined from data review are given for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS and WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. (Circled numbers at the right refer to the materials reviewed for each answer which are listed as sources below.) Finally, a discussion of the analysis is presented for each goal.

4.3.1 Goal I:

To provide supplemental and preparatory training in any occupational field requested and not readily available from other institutions in Whatcom County.

Evaluative Questions:	Range of Possible Answers	Answers: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
1.a. Are students identified as seeking preparatory Training?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes (1)
b. Are students identified as seeking supplementary training?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes (1)
2.a. What % of FTE students are preparatory?	0-100%	19%	14% (1)
b. What % of FTE students are supplementary?	0-100%	6%	16% (1)
3.a. Is training provided for all requests:			
a. from individuals?	All-Some-None	Some	All (2)
b. from groups?	All-Some-None	Some	All (2)
b. How many people are needed to justify a class?	0- ∞	12	12 (2)
4. Is a program generated for every request?	Yes_3 - No_3	No_3	No (2)

(Goal I continued)

Evaluative Questions:	Range of Possible Answers	Answers WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS	
5. if a request is denied,				
a. are reasons given to the requesting party?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes	Yes	(2)
b. is the requesting party directed to an existing program conducted by some other agency?	Always - Sometimes Never	Always	Always	(2)
6. Does the community college keep a continuously updated catalog of occupational training available in its service area?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_1 No_2	No	(2)
7. Does the community college provide only training which is not available in its service area?	Yes - No	Yes_2 No_1	No	(2)

Sources:

(1) MIS-2 reports for four quarters of academic year.

(2) Responses to telephone questionnaire (see Appedix II).

Discussion:

WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS provides both preparatory and supplemental training in nearly equal proportions. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS provides 10% more FTE students with supplemental training than WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. The conditions under which training requested is provided are similar for both campus and non-campus operations. However, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS and one of the proxy colleges utilize many supervised self-instruction programs to train individuals.

WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS provides classes which may be in competition with existing training programs in its service area; it does so because the training available elsewhere is not conveniently located for the requesting party. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS fails to keep a current listing of other occupational training available in Whatcom County.

4.3.2 Goal II:

To provide general education requirements and an Associate of Arts degree program that will transfer to four-year institutions.

Evaluative Questions:	Range of Possible Answers	Answers: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS	
1. With how many four-year institutions in Washington does the community college have Institutional Direct Transfer Agreements?	0-16	8_1 6_2	8	(1)
2. What % of FTE students are enrolled in academic transfer programs?	0-100%	46%	45%	(2)
3. What % of FTE students are enrolled in general education classes?	0-100%	4%	7%	(2)
4.a. Does the community college keep up-to-date lists showing which four-year institutions accept its credits and/or AA degrees?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes	(3)
b. Are such lists available for inspection by students or anyone interested?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes	(3)

Sources:

(1) Inter-College Relations Commission, Institutional Approval of AA Guidelines and Direct Transfer Agreements, November, 1974.

(2) MIS-2 reports for four quarters of academic year.

(3) Responses to telephone questionnaire (see Appendix II).

Discussion:

WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS has Institutional Direct Transfer Agreements with half the four-year institutions in Washington according to a 1974 report. Two of the proxy colleges have fewer such agreements than WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. The non-campus and campus Whatcom serve about the same percentage FTE students with academic transfer programs; WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS serves more general education students.

4.3.3 Goal III:

To provide opportunities for individuals interested in avocational (coursework for pleasure), exploratory and developmental (improving skills) education.

Evaluative Questions:	Range of Possible Answers	WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS	
1.a. Does the community college offer community service avocational courses?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes	(1)
b. What % of students attend these courses?	0-100%	2%	2%	(2)
2.a. Does the community college offer exploratory courses?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2 No_1	Yes	(1)
b. What % of students courses are exploratory?	0-100%	2%	8%	(1)
3.a. Does the community college offer developmental courses?	Yes_3 - No_2	Yes_3	Yes	(1)
b. What % of students attend these courses (adult basic education)?	0-100%	7%	9%	(2)

Sources:

(1) Responses to telephone questionnaire (See Appendix II).

(2) MIS-2 reports for four quarters of academic year.

Discussion:

The percentage of students enrolled in community service courses at WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS does not reflect the range of the three proxies very well: One proxy presents community service avocational courses to 2.5% of its students, the other two proxies less than 1% each. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS falls about midway (1.8%). WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS defines 8 percent of its courses as exploratory while most of the proxies do not define or/and enumerate students who take exploratory classes (e.g. classes taken primarily as a means for helping to determine if the student wants to continue work in a general field). R & PO assumes that any introductory class would be an exploratory class for at least some of the students attending it.

4.3.4 Goal IV:

To provide significant supplemental educational services to meet the identified needs of eight specific target groups.

(see Table I attached)

Table I.

Comparison of Effectiveness on Goal IV (Target Groups)
WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS vs. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS

Evaluative Questions	Range of Possible Answers	Answers for Target Groups							
		a) Unemployed b) Underemployed		Seasonal/ Migrant Workers 9/		Veterans		Native Americans	
		WWC	WW/OC	WWC	WW/OC	WWC	WW/OC	WWC	WW/OC
1. Has the number of the target group in the population been identified? 8/	Yes_3 - No_3	No_2Yes_1	Yes (1)	No_3	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	Yes (1)
2. Has the geographic distribution of the target group been identified?	Yes_3 - No_3	No_2Yes_1	Yes (1)	No_3	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	Yes (1)
3. Have the needs of the target group been identified?	Yes_3 - No_3	No_2Yes_1	Yes (1)	No_3	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	Yes (1)
4. What % of the population 8/ are in the target group?	0 - 100%	a) 3.4% b) no data	a) 2.8% b) no data (2)	25%	24.1% (2)	5%	4.2% (2)	2%	2.4% (2)
5. What % of students are in the target group?	0 - 100%	a) no data b) no data	a) 7% b) 18% (4)	no data	no data	6.5%	6.9% (3)	3% (3)	3% (4)
6. Is the target group informed of the services available?	Yes_3 - No_3	no data	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	no data	Yes (1)	no data	Yes (1)
7. Are reassessments of the target group made on a periodic basis?	Yes_3 - No_3	No	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	no data	No (1)	no data	No (1)

8/ *Population=population of district*
9/ *Whatcom Community College has redefined the migrant/seasonal workers target group as "Spanish-speaking" during the time period of the R&PO analysis. Its future efforts (and monitoring of those efforts) should reflect this change.*

Table 1a.

Comparison of Effectiveness on Goal IV (Target Groups)
WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS vs. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS

Evaluative Questions	Range of Possible Answers	Answers for Target Groups							
		Elderly 10/		Late Starters		Wage Earners		Women	
		WWC	WW/OC	WWC	WW/OC	WWC	WW/OC	WWC	WW/OC
1. Has the number of the target group in the population 8/ been identified?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2No_1	Yes (1)	Yes_1No_2	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	Yes (1)
2. Has the geographic distribution of the target group been identified?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2No_1	Yes (1)	Yes_1No_2	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	Yes (1)
3. Have the needs of the target group been identified?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2No_1	Yes (1)	Yes_1No_2	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	Yes (1)
4. What % of the population 8/ are in the target group?	0 - 100%	12.5%	12% (2)	no data	no data (2)	no data	no data	31%	30% (2)
5. What % of students are in the target group?	0 - 100%	3.4%	3.5% (3)	no data	16% (4)	no data	no data	40%	39% (3)
6. Is the target group informed of the services available?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2No_1	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	Yes_1No_2	No (1)
7. Are reassessments of the target group made on a periodic basis?	Yes_3 - No_3	no data	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	No_3	No (1)	No_3	No (1)

8/ Population = population of district.
10/ Over 60 years of age.

Sources: Responses to telephone questionnaire
(1) Responses to telephone questionnaire (see Appendix II).
(2) 1970 Washington State Census.
(3) MIS I reports for 4 academic quarters (academic & vocational students only).
(4) Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Evaluation Report: Whatcom Community College - Pilot Test of IEP, July 22, 1976.

Discussion:

An Evaluation Report of the Whatcom IEP included information on a sample of 31 students enrolled in developmental courses by target group categories. Of the 31 students sampled, the unemployed, veterans, elderly and late starters are represented in similar proportions to those represented in the academic and occupational categories from the MIS reports on WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. Wage earners and women are significantly less represented (9% and 3% respectively) in the IEP sample, while Native Americans have a greater representation (12%).

Some of the proxy colleges have identified different target populations than those selected by WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. These include Chicanos and agricultural workers. Distributions and numbers of these target groups have been identified and some attempts at needs assessment have occurred. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS and 2 of the 3 proxy colleges have conducted formal needs assessments on some of the target group populations, but neither WHATCOM WITH or WITHOUT CAMPUS has adequately identified characteristics and needs of all their target populations. WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS and the proxy colleges have similar distributions of target groups in the counties in which they serve, and WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is enrolling members of these groups in similar numbers to WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS.

Neither WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS nor WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS has programs to disseminate information concerning available services to each target group, nor does either conduct periodic reassessments of target group needs.

4.3.5 Goal V: To provide all of Whatcom Community College's educational services in locations as convenient as possible to the students and without establishment of a central campus.

Evaluative Questions:	Range of Possible Answers	Answers: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
1. Did the community college establish a central campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes	No
2.a. Is coursework offered:			
(1) on campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	No (1)
(2) off campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	No (1)
(3) during the day?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
(4) during the evening?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)

(Goal V, continued)

Evaluative Questions:	Range of Possible Answers	WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
2.b. What % of students attend classes:			
(1) on campus?	0 - 100%	57%	0%(2)
(2) off campus?	0 - 100%	43%	100%(2)
(3) during the day?	0 - 100%	54%	56%(2)
(4) during the evening?	0 - 100%	46%	44%(2)
3. Is individual counseling offered:			
(1) on campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	No (1)
(2) off campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2 No_1	Yes(1)
(3) during the day?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
(4) during the evening?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_1 No_2	Yes(1)
4. Is educational planning offered to students:			
a. on campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	No (1)
b. off campus?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2 No_1	Yes(1)
c. during the day?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
d. during the evening?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_1 No_2	Yes(1)
5. Does the community college systematically request feedback from the students on the convenience to them of class loactions?	Yes_3 - No_3	no data	Yes_3(1)

Sources: (1) Responses to telephone questionnaire (see Appendix II).
(2) MIS-1 reports for four academic quarters (academic and vocational students only).
(3) Whatcom Community College, "Student Course Follow-up Form."

Discussion:

During Summer Quarter 1975, Fall Quarter 1975 and Winter Quarter 1976, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS provided classes in 53 different locations, 11/ including four instructional centers

11/ *Course offerings schedule for Whatcom Community College, Summer Quarter 1975 through Winter Quarter 1976.*

(each of which provided counseling, registration, advising and some support services) at Lynden, Ferndale, Lummi and Marine Drive (Bellingham). Other locations included fire halls, hospitals, shops, high schools, private homes, etc. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS runs a highly organized and efficient delivery system to the four instructional centers and other locations where classes are routinely held. Students attend WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS evening classes in very similar proportion (46%) to those at non-campus Whatcom (44%). All three proxy colleges offer over 40% of their students off-campus classes. One especially noteworthy finding from this analysis is that the trend in student enrollment over time at all the proxy colleges was toward off-campus and evening classes:

Percent of Students Enrolled 12/

	On-Campus Day		Off-Campus Evening	
	WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
Summer Qtr 1975	33	0	23	32
Fall Qtr 1975	42	0	25	43
Winter Qtr 1976	39	0	28	46
Spring Qtr 1976	37	0	32	47

Although WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS systematically collects data providing feedback from students on the convenience of class locations, they do not tabulate the data routinely. R&PO wonders why this is so. The lack of systematic needs assessment by WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS for their target groups is matched by their lack of needs assessment by geographic area in Whatcom County. It should be noted that assessing needs periodically on a formal basis requires money and time. The only complete needs assessment R&PO found among the proxy colleges was funded by federal dollars. R&PO concludes that adequate, current needs assessments are a problem area for all the community colleges they surveyed. While colleges are required to do needs assessments in order to initiate occupational programs, even those data need periodic updating. 13/

12/ MIS 1 reports (for academic and occupational students only -- does not include community service students.)

13/ The federal government has recently funded Washington State University to do a thorough needs assessment of vocational education needs in a three-state area.

4.3.6 Goal VI: To develop and implement a long-range plan and a systematic planning and evaluation process.

Evaluative Questions	Range	Answers: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
1. Have evaluations been attempted and completed to date?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
2. Does the evaluation system identify what activities the institution accomplishes and how well?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
3. Are decisions made on the basis of evaluative information?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1) (2)
4. Do plans results in real events?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1) (2)
5. Does the Board of Trustees meet regularly for the above tasks?	Yes_3 - No_3	no data	Yes(2)

Sources: (1) Responses to telephone Questionnaire (see Appendix II).
(2) Research and Planning Office, State Board for Community College Education, Evaluative Survey of a Non-Traditional Institution: Whatcom Community College/IEP, August 1976.

Discussion:

Both Whatcom and the proxy colleges participate in the six-year planning program required by the State Board for Community College Education. WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS internally evaluates its programs via performance evaluations of administrators, staff and instructors, and reviews of program objectives and time studies (although one of the proxy colleges conducts systematic evaluations on all programs for accreditation purposes only).

WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS evaluates its programs internally with a designated evaluation team of adminstrators and staff, who in 1975 contacted Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory for assistance in constructing an evaluation plan. The plan consisted of a statement of goals, measurable objectives and data collection procedures and instruments. A pilot test of the

data collection instruments was conducted on 36 classes offered during the 1975-76 academic year, resulting in a set of recommendations for evaluation activities and goal re-definition. 14/

The Institutional Evaluation Plan is a comprehensive set of evaluation questions and instruments which, if implemented consistently, will yield sufficient data to determine if objectives are being met. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS has the evaluation tools and much of the data available to them for evaluation. Yet, in the opinion of the R&PO, Whatcom has not utilized the data to their fullest possible extent; thus, they neglect a source of answers as to whether they have accomplished their objectives.

4.3.7 Goal VII: To conduct Whatcom Community College's operation cooperatively and in coordination with existing educational agencies rather than in competition with them.

Evaluative Questions	Range of Possible Answers	Answers WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS
1. Are there other educational agencies in the community colleges service area?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
2. Does the community college have frequent and documented sontact with other educational agencies in its service area?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2No_1	Yes(1)
3. Are cooperative agreements reached with other educational agencies in the service area?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2 No_1	Yes(1)
4. Are student advisors trained to perform cooperatively and in coordination rather than in competition with other agencies in the service area?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_2No_1	Yes(1)

Source: (1) Responses to telephone questionnaire (see Appendix II).

14/ *Northwest Regional Educational Laboratories, Evaluation Report, Whatcom Community College, Pilot Test of Institutional Evaluation Plan, July 22, 1976.*

Discussion:

This goal appears to be one to which any community college would subscribe. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS uses school district facilities extensively for their classrooms; this cooperation seems smooth and of long duration.

4.3.8 Goal VIII: To select and train staff whose qualifications are appropriate and consistent with the mission and goals of the college.

Evaluative Questions	Range of Possible Answers	Answers: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS	Answers: WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
1. Have staff prerequisites been established as well as a formal selection process?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)
2. Have staff training procedures been established?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_1 No_2	No (1)
3. Are all staff aware of the goals and missions of the college?	Yes_3 - No_3	no data	No (2)
4. Are training and selection needs documented on a periodic basis?	Yes_3 - No_3	no data	No (1)
5. Are all staff aware of the training system?	Yes_3 - No_3	Yes_3	Yes(1)

Sources: (1) Responses to telephone questionnaire (see Appendix II).
(2) Research and Planning Office, State Board for Community College Education, Evaluative Survey of a Non-Traditional Institution: Whatcom Community College/IEP, August 1976.

Discussion:

WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS has substituted for formal in-service training a non-mandatory, informal orientation for all faculty consisting of a programmed instructional package of materials. Two of the three proxy colleges comprising WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS have formal workshops or work sessions for new instructors (one requires one half-day session seach quarter).

Data from interviews with WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS staff indicate that the administrators are aware of and subscribe to the missions and goals of the college. However, instructors interviewed (all of whome were part-time) are less aware of the goals and objectives. No data from the proxy colleges on staff awareness of objectives and goals is available.

4.4 Summary

4.4.1 Six of the eight goals which Whatcom Community College seekes to achieve are consistent with the operating stance of all three proxy colleges to which R&PO compared WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS R&PO found that WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS was performing at least as well as WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. Indeed, regarding Goals I through III and VI through VIII, there seems little reason why having a campus or non-campus operation would make any difference for effectiveness in achieving a good performance.

4.4.2 On Goal IV, however, the data show that WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS did no better than its counterpart WITH CAMPUS at assessing and meeting needs of its target groups. While, by comparison, Whatcom's innovative approach looks about equal to more traditional approaches, R&PO feels that since Whatcom stated so specifically the target groups they sought to serve, and since (theoretically) a basic goal of external degree programs is to serve more "new students" than tradiational campus-based institutions, the performance of WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is disappointing on this goal. Our disappointment is somewhat ameliorated by data from Britain's Open University, which sought to serve a more heterogeneous student population with its extended degree program. There too many fewer of the "new" type of students at whom their approach was aimed used the services the Open University provided.

4.4.3 Finally, on Goal V, the goal which relates most directly to Whatcom's non-campus operation, R&PO found that Whatcom Community College is realizing its desire to provide educational services without establishing a central campus. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS has implemented activities which support that goal and its performance in delivering comparable services and coursework completely off campus is praiseworthy. 4.5 will discuss the dollar cost of doing so.

4.5 Dollar Costs of Non-Campus vs Campus Operation

4.5.1 This section will compare by program areas the costs of WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS (from 1975-76 Whatcom Community College Budget) with those of WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS, a hypothetical model whose costs are determined by combining and averaging budget amounts by program area (1974-75) for three "proxy" community colleges in Washington.

4.5.2 Adminstration. Whether computed by FTE, by course, or by student, adminstrative costs for the non-campus Whatcom are higher (from 37% higher per student - 59% higher per FTE student). Appendix II, Part A gives a breakdown by category for cost per student comparing WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS to WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS based on detailed budgets from two proxy colleges

4.5.2.1 The biggest difference occurs in travel, where costs per student at WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS are 64% higher than WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. R&PO understands that higher travel costs can be directly linked to the activities necessary for a totally non-campus operation.

4.5.2.2 Also much higher are salaries and wages and employee benefits. Part B of Appendix III gives an explanation of those differences. Instead of assigning secretarial and clerical staff to various program areas, all secretarial and clerical staff are organized into one secretarial service pool at WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. This pool is included in the administrative budget. At $83,000+ for one year, this is a very expensive item and it is not clear to us what necessary link exists between pooled secretarial support and non-campus operation.

4.5.2.3 WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spends 21% more per student on goods and services. R&PO found the bulk of the higher cost in multiple duplicating machines serving the instructional centers. This obviously results from Whatcom's non-campus operations.

4.5.3 Student Services. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spends 41% more per FTE, 14% more per course and 9% more per student on student services than WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. As noted above, this extra expense pays for student services in the evening and at multiple locations. Only one of the proxy colleges R&PO studied provides comparable evening, off-campus student services While that particular proxy college's cost per course and per student are higher than Whatcom's, its cost per FTE student is $202 compared to Whatcom's $238. The latter difference may be due to the proxy's 51% part-time students compared to Whatcom's 80% part-time. 15/

4.5.4 Plant Maintenance and Operation. Costs for this program are lower for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS than for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. This is not surprising given Whatcom's non-campus configuration. No parking lots, no classroom buildings, and no lawns or flower beds require upkeep. In this program, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS includes nearly $90,000 for leased facilities and rents for community classrooms and meeting places. This is eight times the average rental budget for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. R&PO calculates that it would take over a century at $90,000 per

15/ PT computation based on MIS-1 figures which count academic and occupational students only.

year for Whatcom's space costs to equal the estimated $9,970,000 for design and construction of a campus. Included in Plant Maintenance and Operation is the delivery van service which makes three rounds to all the instructional centers every working day. R&PO found this service well organized and efficient. Its contribution to the non-campus operation is substantial.

4.5.5 Learning Resources. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spend 34-58% more on learning resources than WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. R&PO found that most of this higher expense stems from equipment costs to establish an LRC for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. Unfortunately for Whatcom, there is no large regional library with broad and efficient extension services in its area. Thus, although WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is a member of the Community College Library Consortium, it still needs its own LRC facilities. Included in LRC expense are multiple sets of basic reference books (i.e., encyclopedia, dictionary) for each instructional center. Appendix V gives a breakdown of LRC expenses.

4.5.6 Instruction. Instruction costs at WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS are lower than those for instruction at WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. R&PO inferred the following reasons for the lower costs from the budgets of Whatcom Community College and two proxy colleges.

A. 82% of WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS faculty are part-time while 61% of WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS faculty are part-time (see Appendix VI, Part B). This results in 33% lower expenditure per student for salaries and wages and 40% lower per student for employee benefits. WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spent 86% less per student in the category "Personal Services Contract." It is not clear to us why such a large difference occurs, but it may be due to the different manner in which one of the proxy colleges pays its equivalent of Whatcom's "community faculty."

B. No secretarial or clerical personnel are included in the Instruction program expenses for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS while such support is part of the budget for instruction for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. However, cost for clerical salaries and wages at WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS is only 4% of the Instruction budget. Therefore, the major portion of the 34% difference in total instructional costs/student must be due to the differing proportion of part-time and full-time faculty.

4.5.7 Total. Table I presents a summary of the costs comparison by program area and the difference in total cost for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS vs WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS. The non-campus Whatcom costs 29% more per FTE student than the campus Whatcom. However, per course WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spends 6% less and per student, Whatcom spends 10% less than the average campus-based operation. What is interesting is that such a cost difference appears in the operating expenses favoring the non-campus approach without including the capital investment required for a campus. The lower per student cost for plant operation and maintenance and for instruction offset the extra cost per student for extension of student services and LRC operations.

Table II.

Comparison of Costs: WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS
vs WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS
Cost/FTE, Cost/Course, Cost/Student (Annualized Headcount)

	Range of Proxy Colleges	WHATCOM 1/ WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS 2/	% 3/ Difference
Annualized FTE		1,800.65	882.81	
Annualized No. of Courses		384	261	
Annualized Headcount		3,460	2,474	
Cost: Total		$2,361,661	$1,512,247	
Cost/FTE	$1,296 - $1,331	1,312	1,838	29%
Cost/Course	5,365 - 6,183	6,150	5,794	(6%)
Cost/Student	554 - 676	682	611	(10%)
Cost: Administration		300,260	340,772	
Cost/FTE	156 - 180	167	414	60%
Cost/Course	655 - 911	782	1,306	40%
Cost/Student	68 - 109	87	138	37%
Cost: Student Services		248,079	195,414	
Cost/FTE	87 - 202	138	238	42%
Cost/Course	415 - 1,021	646	749	14%
Cost/Student	45 - 122	72	79	9%
Cost: Plant Maint & Oper		266,656	153,487	
Cost/FTE	110 - 196	148	187	21%
Cost/Course	514 - 934	694	588	(15%)
Cost/Student	53 - 102	77	62	(19%)
Cost: Learning Resources		141,362	153,196	
Cost/FTE	58 - 99	79	186	58%
Cost/Course	292 - 472	368	587	37%
Cost/Student	32 - 52	41	62	34%
Cost: Instruction		1,405,304	669,378	
Cost/FTE	758 - 846	780	814	4%
Cost/Course	3,411 - 3,869	3,660	2,565	(30%)
Cost/Student	352 - 462	406	271	(33%)

1/ Average ($\bar{x}$) of three proxy colleges = WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS.
Source: 1974-75 budgets for each proxy community college.
2/ Source: 1975-76 budget for Whatcom Community College.
3/ (_%) = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS lower by _%.
_% = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS higher by _%.

4.5.8 Summarizing the relationship of higher costs/FTE for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS to its effectiveness, R&PO concludes:

4.5.8.1 The higher effectiveness of Whatcom in providing evening and off-campus counseling, advising, referral and student advocacy justify the higher cost per FTE student in Student Services (42% more).

4.5.8.2 The effectiveness of Whatcom in providing its classes in the community justifies the amount spent/FTE student in Plant Maintenance and Operation for rental and leases and the delivery system to support the multiple locations. This accounts for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spending 21% more/FTE than campus-based colleges spend for this program.

4.5.8.3 WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS spends 4% more/FTE student on Instruction. R&PO found that Whatcom provides a higher percentage of its students with instruction in categories of: supplementary occupational, general education, exploratory and adult/basic education, all goals to which Whatcom subscribes in its mandates. They perform less well than WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS only with preparatory occupational students. The latter may be accounted for by the availability of such training in Whatcom County through the Bellingham Vocational and Technical Institute.

4.5.8.4 The higher cost/FTE in Administration is impossible to directly link to effectiveness in attaining Whatcom's goals. The goals linked to administration, i.e.,coordination with local educational agencies, staff training and evaluation/planning do not show more than comparable effectiveness to WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS' performance. There may be indirect links between others of Whatcom's goals to its 60% higher cost/FTE student, but it remains for Whatcom to explicate these linkages.

4.5.8.5 The 58% higher cost/FTE student for Learning Resources may be linked to Whatcom's providing the additional learning resource-types of support in four centers. However, R&PO found the bulk of the higher cost in establishing one library-type center. The latter development is difficult to directly relate to effectiveness in achieving Whatcom's goals.

5.0 Future Costs and Benefits

5.1 If Whatcom Community College continues its operations in a manner similar to its efforts in 1975-76, it should continue to compare favorably in the amount of educational services it provides to similarly situated community colleges in Washington. Its performance in meeting its mandates is satisfactory in all areas except that a concerted effort might produce better results in serving its target groups (by formally assessing their needs and enlisting faculty efforts in presenting courses

specifically addressed to those needs). 16/

5.2 Except for the program area Learning Resources, costs for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS will probably look much like they did for the year R&PO analyzed. The most important question which arose from our analysis is whether future funding for Whatcom should be based on the number of FTE students. R&PO found that 80% of Whatcom's academic and occupational students are part-time. Given its extended degree-type services, WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS would anticipate such a preponderance of part-time students. These are exactly the people such an educational alternative seeks to serve. Their majority presence signals success to WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. Basing Whatcom's funding on FTE students will work a continual hardship on its extension efforts. Further, by demonstrating a lower cost per course and per student, Whatcom has presented a viable alternative approach to education.

5.3 If Whatcom were the only college serving the "new" part-time student who seeks a degree but cannot do so as a traditional full-time student, the case for considering a change to funding based on total numbers of students or pattern of part-time/full-time students might be weak. Consider, however, the trend presented below for the proxy Whatcom, computed from data reported for academic and occupational students at three colleges:

Quarter	% of Academic & Occupational Students who were part-time
Summer 1974	81%
Fall 1974	58%
Winter 1975	59%
Spring 1975	63%

16/ Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory found that responses by faculty to the question "to which target population(s) is your course addressed?" indicated that most courses reviewed were not addressed to any of the particular target populations mandated. They concluded that either "the staff does not understand the nature of the mandate or...the concept (of target groups) is no longer realistic for Whatcom." (p.46) From its interviews with Whatcom faculty and staff regarding the mandates, R&PO believes the lack of faculty understanding of the mandate is far more likely to be the source of the problem.

5.4 Relating the increasing percentage of part-time students to a trend toward higher numbers of students enrolling in off-campus and evening classes in all three campus-based colleges (4.3.5) and to higher average age for academic and occupational students at Whatcom and the proxy colleges (both over 30), the conclusion is clear. FTE students will become less and less a representative figure at least for the community colleges serving areas such as Whatcom County. This is not to suggest that all the community colleges in Washington should shut down their campuses. But it does seem that community colleges providing an important alternative style of education to persons who would otherwise not get the training they need should not be penalized by using a figure, FTE student, which is more appropriate to four-year colleges and universities. In the last analysis those who are really penalized by funding based on FTE are not the colleges, but rather the persons who choose to work and maintain a home in non-metropolitan communities who have decreased access to educational services they desire.

5.5 An example of the "dollar and cents" implications of adjusting funds to account for the type of students Whatcom Community College serves by its non-campus operation is that to the 1975-76 budget for instruction, $333,999 would have to be added in order to bring Whatcom's cost per student into parity with the average amount per student spent by campus-based colleges. However, since funding for most of the community colleges in the Washington system is currently based on FTE count, a short term solution might be to "split the difference," make 16.5% adjustment instead of a full 33%. Therefore, R&PO recommends that the SBCCE add $166,995 to Whatcom's 1976-77 budget for Instruction. Similar adjustments would be made on the same formula:

5.6 1975-76 budget figure for Whatcom Community College + (cost/student WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS - cost/student WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS x annualized headcount)

= new budget for Whatcom Community College

Table III illustrates the sorts of adjustments we recommend.

6.0 Criterion for Selecting Alternative

6.1 At the Whatcom Demonstration Project Committee meeting on April 27, 1976, the R&PO presented its final evaluation plan. At that time, it was established that "the alternative which most fully meets all the Whatcom Community College objectives would be considered the better alternative." R&PO has determined that WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is doing at least as well as the average performance of three proxy colleges who made up a comparison WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS.

TABLE III.
SUGGESTED ADJUSTMENTS FOR WHATCOM COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUDGET
TRANSITIONAL SOLUTION TO CREATE MORE PARITY WITH CAMPUS-BASED COLLEGES

(I) 1975-76 Whatcom Budget by Program	(II) $	(III) Difference in cost/Student Whatcom w/Campus minus Whatcom wo/Campus	(IV) Difference X 1975-76 Annualized Headcount 17/	(V) R &PO Recommended Adjustment	(VI) New Budget for Program
Administration	$ 340,772	($ 87-$ 38) = -$ 51	-126,174	-63,087 18/	$ 277,685
Student Services	195,414	(72- 79) = - 5	- 17,318	0 19/	195,414
Plant Maintenance and Operation	153,487	(77- 62) = + 15	+ 37,110	0 20/	153,487
Learning Resources	153,196	(41- 62) = - 21	- 51,954	-25,977 21/	127,219
Instruction	669,378	(406- 271) = + 135	+333,999	+166,995 22/	836,373
Total	$1,512,247	($682-$611) = +$ 71	+175,674	$ 77,931	$1,590,178

51

17/ Annualized headcount = 2474 students.

18/ Since secretarial services are included only in the administrative budget, and higher duplicating cost is justified by non-campus style, cut by 1/2 the amount needed for total parity (column).

19/ Since more services are provided (evening and off-campus), slightly higher cost/student (9%) is justifiable; no change.

20/ Savings in plant maintenance match costs for rents/leases for community meeting places plus delivery cost; no change.

21/ Equipment costs for establishing LRC should diminish with completion of LRC; additional cost for multiple "mini-LRC's" will continue; split the difference (50% of total parity).

22/ Lower cost for faculty made up of largely part-time "community" faculty will continue; higher salary and benefit costs may be necessary to hold onto or attract new community faculty as well as to make up for smaller class size because of extension; split the difference.

6.2 If cost were a criterion, R&PO feels that cost per student is a fair comparison given the target population Whatcom Community College seeks to serve. It is an older student population which overwhelmingly attends college part-time. 23/ Since the student populations at all three proxy colleges show a trend toward attending off-campus and in the evening, comparing cost/FTE student has diminishing utility. Comparing cost/student for total operations (not including cost of designing and constructing a campus), WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS is the cheaper alternative.

6.3 Given their effective performance in meeting their goals at a lower cost/student, R&PO recommends:

6.3.1 SBCCE consider adjusting the budget formula for Whatcom Community College, at least in the transitional manner described in the preceding section (Table III).

6.3.2 That the SBCCE consider a long-range plan to switch its funding formula to one based on per course or per student annualized counts at least for colleges which serve a high percentage of part-time students with off-campus and/or evening classes.

23/ Based on MIS figures for academic and occupational students only; does not include community service students, who can be assumed to be even older, on the average, and even more likely to be part-time students.

APPENDIX I, PART A.
PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM FOR WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY QUARTILE - FY 1973-74*

Adm & Gen Exp	Student Services	Plant Operation & Maintenance	Library	Instruction
24.8 Whatcom	14.5 Wenatchee	11.6 Grays Harbor	8.3 Tacoma	79.3 Big Bend
13.1 Wenatchee	13.9 Bellevue	11.3 Centralia/OVTI	7.9 Walla Walla	72.8 Olympic
12.0 Grays Harbor	13.5 Green River	11.1 Bellevue	7.6 Bellevue	70.2 Spokane
11.7 Lower Columbia	11.5 Highline	11.1 Columbia Basin	6.4 Shoreline	69.5 Yakima
11.5 Ft. Steilacoom	11.4 Walla Walla	10.4 Spokane	6.0 Peninsula	67.2 Skagit
	11.3 Seattle		6.0 Skagit	
11.4 Peninsula	11.1 Tacoma	10.1 Clark	5.9 Whatcom	66.5 Shoreline
11.3 Seattle	10.8 Skagit Valley	10.1 Tacoma	5.2 Clark	65.2 Peninsula
10.8 Walla Walla	10.7 Ft. Steil.	9.8 Highline	5.2 Wenatcheee	65.2 Lower Columbia
10.8 Tacoma	10.4 Lower Colum.	9.7 Seattle	5.3 Edmonds/Ever.	65.2 Clark
10.4 Centralia/OVTI	10.4 Shoreline	9.1 Edmonds/Ever.	5.2 Ft. Steil.	65.8 Columbia Basin
				65.1 Edmonds/Ever.
10.2 Highline	10.2 Centralia/OVTI	8.7 Walla Walla	4.9 Seattle	65.0 Ft. Steilacoom
10.2 Clark	10.2 Whatcom	8.4 Green River	4.2 Columbia Bas.	64.8 Green River
9.9 Edmonds/Ever.	10.1 Columbia Bas.	8.3 Whatcom	4.1 Green River	64.2 Highline
9.9 Spokane	10.0 Olympic	8.2 Peninsula	3.9 Grays Harbor	63.8 Centralia/OVTI
9.5 Yakima	9.5 Edmonds/Ever.	8.0 Yakima	3.9 Highline	62.8 Grays Harbor
8.7 Green River	9.4 Yakima	7.7 Wenatchee	3.8 Lower Colum.	
8.5 Shoreline	8.8 Grays Harbor	7.5 Lower Colum.	3.6 Olympic	60.9 Walla Walla
8.3 Skagit	8.8 Clark	7.3 Shoreline	3.3 Yakima	60.5 Seattle
8.1 Columbia Basin	7.5 Peninsula	6.7 Skagit	3.1 Spokane	58.5 Tacoma
6.8 Olympic	6.1 Spokane	6.9 Ft. Steil.	2.9 Cent./OVTI	58.4 Wenatchee
5.9 Big Bend	5.9 Big Bend	6.5 Big Bend	2.1 Big Bend	55.4 Bellevue
		6.2 Olympic		47.8 Whatcom

Source: *SBCCE Budget Report "Washington Community Colleges Expenditures by Program, Fiscal Year 1973-74.*

*First year of biennium 1973-75

Wenatchee 4/5
Ft. Steilacoom 2/5
Bellevue 2/5

PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM FOR WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY QUARTILE - FY 1974-75*

ADMINISTRATIVE & GENERAL EXPENSES		STUDENT SERVICES		PLANT OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		LIBRARY		INSTRUCTION	
21.9	Whatcom	16.2	Wenatchee	15.1	Walla Walla	7.6	Walla Walla	78.7	Big Bend
13.6	Wenatchee	14.8	Green River	12.6	Centralia/OVTI	7.6	Whatcom	73.3	Olympic
12.2	Peninsula	13.8	Highline	12.5	Grays Harbor	7.3	Bellevue	70.1	Spokane
12.1	Walla Walla	13.4	Bellevue	11.3	Columbia Bas	6.8	Shoreline	68.3	Skagit
11.7	L. Columbia	11.7	Cent./OVTI	10.9	Whatcom	6.7	Tacoma	68.1	Yakima
11.6	Seattle							66.2	Shoreline
11.2	Bellevue	11.4	Seattle	10.4	Highline	6.6	Peninsula	65.9	L. Columbia
10.9	Grays Harbor	11.4	Tacoma	10.3	Bellevue	6.6	Ft. Steil.	65.6	Columbia Basin
10.9	Edmonds/Ever.	11.0	L. Columbia	9.9	Clark	6.6	Skagit	65.1	Edmonds/Everett
10.7	Cent./OVTI	10.9	Ft. Steil.	9.9	Spokane	6.1	Clark	63.6	Ft. Steilacoom
10.6	Tacoma	10.8	Whatcom	9.6	Seattle	5.3	Edmonds/Ever	63.4	Peninsula
		10.7	Columbia Bas			5.0	Seattle	63.4	Clark
10.5	Clark	10.6	Shoreline	9.4	Ft. Steil.	4.5	Columbia Bas	62.6	Green River
10.0	Highline	9.9	Yakima	9.4	Tacoma	4.4	L. Columbia	61.9	Highline
9.9	Spokane	9.6	Edmonds/Ever.	9.3	Green River	4.4	Wenatchee	61.9	Centralia/OVTI
9.5	Yakima	9.3	Olympic	9.1	Edmonds/Ever	4.2	Green River	61.9	Tacoma
9.5	Ft. Steilacoom	9.2	Grays Harbor	9.1	Big Bend	4.1	Spokane	60.8	Seattle
				8.7	Peninsula				
9.1	Green River	9.1	Clark	8.4	Wenatchee	3.9	Highline	60.4	Grays Harbor
8.5	Shoreline	9.0	Peninsula	8.2	Skagit	3.8	Grays Harbor	57.8	Bellevue
8.4	Skagit	8.5	Skagit	7.7	Yakima	3.2	Olympic	58.5	Walla Walla
8.0	Columbia Basin	6.7	Walla Walla	7.4	Shoreline	3.2	Yakima	57.2	Wenatchee
7.0	Olympic	6.0	Spokane	7.0	L. Columbia	3.0	Centralia	48.8	Whatcom
6.3	Big Bend	4.3	Big Bend	6.6	Olympic	1.6	Big Bend		

Source: SBCCE Budget Report, "Washington Community Colleges Expenditures by Program, Fiscal Year 1974-75."

*Second year of biennium 1973-75

Walla Walla	4/5
Bellevue	2 - 2.2/5
Seattle	2/5
Lower Columbia	2/5
Wenatchee	2/5

PERCENT OF BUDGETED BASIC ALLOCATIONS BY PROGRAM
FOR WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY QUARTILE - FY 1975-76*

ADMINISTRATIVE & GENERAL EXPENSES		STUDENT SERVICES		PLANT OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		LIBRARY		INSTRUCTION	
17.8	Whatcom	20.2	Whatcom	23.4	Big Bend	6.7	Tacoma	66.3	Shoreline
14.8	Peninsula	14.6	Peninsula	13.8	Clark	6.5	Ft. Steil.	65.6	Highline
13.5	Grays Harbor	13.6	Grays Harbor	13.6	Walla Walla	6.1	Shoreline	65.4	L. Columbia
13.5	Centralia/OVTI	13.5	Cent/OVTI	13.5	Seattle	5.8	Wenatchee	65.2	Spokane
13.1	Wenatchee	12.7	Skagit	13.4	Wenatchee	5.7	Bellevue	63.7	Tacoma
12.9	Big Bend	12.3	Ft. Steil.			5.7	Edmonds/Ever	63.6	Green River
12.0	L. Columbia	11.7	Walla Walla	13.0	Bellevue	5.6	Highline	63.0	Edmonds/Ever.
11.7	Ft. Steil.	11.5	Big Bend	12.9	Grays Harbor	5.6	Green River	62.8	Seattle
11.7	Walla Walla	11.2	Edmonds/Ever	12.8	Yakima	5.6	L. Columbia	62.5	Olympic
11.6	Skagit	11.3	Clark	11.7	Green River	5.6	Spokane	61.7	Columbia Bas.
11.2	Tacoma	11.1	Columbia Bas	11.4	Columbia Bas	5.5	Yakima	61.0	Yakima
		11.0	Olympic	11.2	Whatcom				
10.8	Edmonds/Ever	10.7	L. Columbia	11.0	Olympic	5.4	Clark	60.6	Bellevue
10.7	Columbia Bas	10.7	Spokane	10.7	Skagit	5.4	Whatcom	60.4	Ft. Steilacoom
10.6	Clark	10.5	Highline	10.5	Cent./OVTI	5.3	Olympic	59.8	Skagit
10.6	Yakima	10.4	Bellevue	10.4	Peninsula	5.3	Walla Walla	58.9	Clark
10.3	Bellevue	10.4	Tacoma	9.3	Edmonds/Ever.	5.2	Peninsula	57.7	Walla Walla
10.2	Olympic			9.1	Ft. Steil.	5.2	Skagit	57.5	Wenatchee
						5.2	Seattle		
						5.2	Centralia		
9.9	Shoreline	10.2	Wenatchee	8.8	Spokane	5.1	Grays Harbor	57.3	Centralia
9.8	Highline	10.1	Yakima	8.5	Highline	5.1	Columbia Bas	55.0	Peninsula
9.7	Green River	9.4	Green River	8.4	Shoreline	4.6	Big Bend	54.9	Grays Harbor
9.7	Spokane	9.3	Shoreline	8.0	Tacoma			47.6	Big Bend
9.3	Seattle	9.2	Seattle	7.3	L. Columbia			45.4	Whatcom

35.

Source: SBCCE "Distribution of State Funds, 1975-76."

*First year of biennium 1975-77

Peninsula	4/5
Grays Harbor	4/5
Centralia/OVTI	4/5
Big Bend	2/5
Skagit	2/5

PERCENT OF BUDGETED BASIC ALLOCATIONS BY PROGRAM
FOR WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY QUARTILE - FY 1976-77*

ADMINISTRATIVE & GENERAL EXPENSES		STUDENT SERVICES		PLANT OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		LIBRARY		INSTRUCTION	
17.0	Whatcom	19.4	Whatcom	24.5	Big Bend	6.5	Tacoma	65.7	Shoreline
14.9	Peninsula	14.6	Peninsula	14.1	Clark	6.2	Ft. Steil.	64.8	Highline
13.6	Grays Harbor	13.6	Grays Harbor	14.0	Wenatchee	5.9	Shoreline	64.1	L. Columbia
13.5	Cent./OVTI	13.2	Cent./OVTI	14.0	Whatcom	5.5	Bellevue	64.0	Spokane
13.2	Wenatchee	12.4	Skagit	13.9	Seattle	5.5	Wenatchee	63.4	Tacoma
		12.4	Ft. Steil						
12.9	Big Bend	11.6	Walla Walla	13.6	Yakima	5.4	Edmonds/Ever	62.9	Green River
12.1	L. Columbia	11.3	Big Bend	13.3	Walla Walla	5.4	Green River	62.6	Edmonds/Ever.
11.9	Ft. Steil.	11.2	Edmonds/Ever	13.2	Grays Harbor	5.3	L. Columbia	62.5	Seattle
11.8	Walla Walla	11.2	Clark	13.1	Bellevue	5.3	Yakima	62.3	Olympic
11.6	Skagit	11.0	Olympic	12.6	Green River	5.2	Spokane	60.9	Columbia Basin
11.5	Tacoma	11.0	Columbia Bas	12.5	Columbia Bas	5.2	Highline		
						5.2	Clark		
11.0	Edmonds/Ever	10.6	L. Columbia	12.2	Skagit	5.1	Peninsula	60.5	Bellevue
10.8	Clark	10.5	Bellevue	11.8	Central/OVTI	5.1	Olympic	60.5	Ft. Steila
10.7	Yakima	10.5	Spokane	11.3	Olympic	5.0	Walla Walla	60.4	Yakima
10.7	Columbia Bas	10.4	Highline	10.6	Spokane	5.0	Grays Harbor	58.9	Skagit
10.4	Bellevue	10.4	Tacoma	10.5	Peninsula	5.0	Cent./OVTI	48.7	Clark
10.3	Olympic							58.3	Walla Walla
10.0	Shoreline	10.2	Wenatchee	9.8	Edmonds/Ever.	4.9	Skagit	57.1	Wenatchee
9.9	Highline	10.0	Yakima	9.7	Highline	4.9	Columbia Bas	56.5	Centralia/OVTI
9.8	Green River	9.3	Green River	9.1	Shoreline	4.8	Seattle	54.9	Peninsula.
9.7	Spokane	9.3	Shoreline	9.0	Ft. Steil.	4.7	Whatcom	54.6	Grays Harbor
9.5	Seattle	9.3	Seattle	8.2	Tacoma	4.4	Big Bend	46.9	Big Bend
								44.9	Whatcom

Source: SBCCE, "Distribution of State Funds, 1976-77."

*Second year of biennium 1975-77

Peninsula	3/5
Grays Harbor	3/5
Centralia/OVTI	3/5
Wenatchee	3/5
Skagit	3/5
Big Bend	3/5

APPENDIX I, PART B.

Correlation of Numbers of FTE Students
In Each HEGIS Institutional Intent Category
with Whatcom Community College
Fall Quarter 1975

Community College	Correlation
Bellevue	.92
Wenatchee Valley	.89
Shoreline	.88
Fort Steilacoom	.88
Walla Walla	.86*
Centralia	.85
Peninsula	.84
Everett	.85*
Edmonds	.83*
Clark	.79
Green River	.76
Tacoma	.74*
Seattle North	.72
Highline	.71
Spokane Falls	.71
Skagit Valley	.69
Yakima Valley	.68
Grays Harbor	.65
Big Bend	.60
Olympic	.59
Columbia Basin	.58
Seattle Central	.54
Lower Columbia	.33
Shelton	.02*
Seattle South	.00*
Spokane	-.07*

* Correlation based on less than the typical 13 HEGIS categories.

Source: SBCCE MIS-2 Report, Fall Quarter 1975.

APPENDIX II.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR "PROXY" COLLEGES: WHATCOM DEMONSTRATION PROJECT EVALUATION

SECTION I: OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

1. Does your community college have occupational preparatory training to provide entry-level skills:

2. Does your community college have occupational supplementary training to upgrade skills of persons already employed in an occupation?

3. Do you provide training requested by:

   a) individual students?
   b) groups of students?
   c) groups of persons having an interest in an occupation?

4. Is a program generated for every request?

5. How many people are needed to justify a class?

6. If a program is not generated for every request, is every request nonetheless documented and its disposition documented?

7. If requests are denied, are reasons given in writing to the requesting party?

8. If requests are denied, is the requesting party directed in writing to an existing program conducted by some other agency?

9. Does your community college have a continuously updated catalog of all other occupational opportunities available in your service area?

10. Does your Community College provide only training which is not available in your county in any of the following agencies or settings:

    a) Public
    b) Private
    c) Formal
    d) Informal

11. If programs or single courses are created, or have been created in apparent competition with existing programs, are reasons for doing so documented?

12. Are these courses created although the services are available in general, they are not specifically available to a particular student for the following reasons:

    a) Cost
    b) Location

SECTION II: TRANSFER PROGRAMS

1. Is your CC's AA degree program capable of transfer?

2. Is your CC's unorganized (non-AA degree) courses capable of transfer?

3. Does your CC contain up-to-date lists showing which four-year institutions accept credit and/or AA degrees for your CC?

4. Are such lists available for inspection by the following:

    a) By anyone interested?
    b) By potential students?

SECTION III: GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. Does your CC provide the following type of course work:

   a) Community/vocational: taken primarily for pleasure, hobby, or other recreational purposes?

      1) how many?
      2) what courses?

   b) Exploratory: taken primarily as a means for helping to determine if the student wants to continue work in that general field?

      1) how many?
      2) what percentage of courses?

   c) Developmental education: taken primarily for the purpose of impriving skills or understanding deemed to be below the acceptable level of student's age, experience and aspirations?

      1) how many?
      2) what percentage of courses?

2. Is it possible for your community college to designate whenever the student takes a particular course or any combination of these purposes?

3. Do you think it is important to know?

SECTION IV: TARGET POPULATION

1. Which of the following groups would you define as a special target group of your community college?

   a) Any person who professes to be not gainfully employed, who needs vocational skills to find work.

   b) Any person who professes to be capable and interested in higher levels of, more consistent, or otherwise better employment who therefore needs vocational skills to advance and become secure in his/her employment (underemployed).

c) Any person who is employed and resides in your county part of the year, and is employed and resides elsewhere the rest of the year.

d) Any person who is normally employed only during a certain season or seasons of the year who is a full-time resident of your county.

e) Any veteran of military service seeking educational services to improve his life in any way.

f) Any veteran who professes to be seeking educational services to compensate for educational, social, or employment opportunities lost due to participation in military service.

g) Any member of an Indian tribe or other native American group (including Eskimo and Aleut) who seek educational services.

h) Students whose high school records do not show any evidence of interest in college, and who have been out of high school for more than one year, and who presently profess to be interested in a transfer program.

i) Students who wish to complete high school.

j) A person gainfully employed on a regular schedule at times when cultural enrichment activities are normally conducted in your county (i.e. night shift workers).

2. What other groups would you define as a <u>special target group</u> of your community college?

3. Has a formal needs assessment been conducted for each of the special target groups for your community college?

4. Is the documentation on those needs available for inspection?

5. Does your CC take on responsibility for ensuring that those educational needs not provided for elsewhere by these special target groups will somehow be addressed?

6. Is the amount of services provided to each target group large enough to be measured for the particular group?

7. Does your CC seek out senior citizens and actively offer services to them?

8. Does your CC document such efforts and their results?

9. Do you have listings of avocational and community services and health programs available to the elderly?

10. Do you have documented plans for bringing them to the attention of the elderly?

11. Are these plans available for inspection?

12. Do you provide the following cultural enrichment activities?

    a) Concerts?
    b) Art shows?
    c) Film screenings?
    d) Plays?
    e) Pageants?
    f) Festivals?
    g) Dances?
    h) Lectures?
    i) Other?

13. Do your student records indicate whether or not student is a wage-earner and if so, what his normal work hours are?

14. Does your CC maintain a time schedule and calendar of all cultural events in your county?

15. Are events at your community college scheduled for those wage earners who are unable to participate in other cultural events in the county?

16. Are the numbers of potential participants documented for each special event scheduled?

17. Do you have courses for females 18 years or older (or who have graduated from high school) in the following categories:

    a) Course work with or without credit taken primarily for the purpose of improving skills or understanding deemed to be below an acceptable level for her age, experience and aspirations (developmental education)?

18. Do you keep additional records on women students regarding the student's perceptions of the programs offered her vis a vis her personal sex concept and social role?

19. Is course work (measured in credit hours) offered to all the target groups:

    a) On campus?
    b) Off campus?
    c) During the day?
    d) In the evening?

20. Is individual counseling (measured in contact hours) offered to all target groups:

    a) On campus?
    b) Off campus?
    c) During the day?
    d) In the evening?

21. Is educational planning available to all the target groups:

    a) On campus?
    b) Off campus?
    c) During the day?
    d) In the evening?

22. Is referral to other agencies available to all the target groups:

    a) On campus?
    b) Off campus?
    c) During the day?
    d) In the evening?

23. Are negotiations between agencies on behalf of a particular student available to the target groups:

    a) On campus?
    b) Off campus?
    c) During the day?
    d) In the evening?

SECTION V: COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

1. Are there other existing educational agencies in your county? If so, which are they?

2. If there are, is there frequent and documented contact between your community college and the other educational agencies in your county?

3. Are cooperative agreements reached with other educational agencies?

4. Are such cooperative agreements documented and available?

5. Are student advisors and program planners trained to perform cooperatively and in coordination rather than in competition with existing educational agencies in your county?

SECTION VI: LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND EVALUATION

1. What mechanism does your CC use in long-range planning for activities and programs?

2. How does your CC evaluate its activities and programs?

SECTION VII: STAFF TRAINING

1. What sort of in-service training do you provide to your staff?

SECTION VIII: CAMPUS/OFF-CAMPUS OPERATIONS

1. What advantage do you feel having a campus provides to your CC?

2. If you have extensions, how do you feel these augment the services your college provides?

SECTION IX: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

APPENDIX III, PART B.

Administration Cost Breakdown

Part B: Secretarial Pool Detail - WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS

Number FT	PT	Position Title	Cost
1		Coordinator	$12,715
2		Secretary	
4		Typist	
1	1	Copy Machine Operator	62,014
1		Mag. Card/Tape Typist	
1		Telephone Operator	
	x	Temporary (for overload periods)	5,335
		Students (includes work-study)	3,104
Total			$83,168

APPENDIX IV.

Plant Maintenance and Operation Cost Breakdown

	WHATCOM 1/ WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITH-OUT CAMPUS	% Difference 2/
Annualized Headcount	3,110	2,474	
Code Category			
B Salaries and Wages	$88,022	$23,573	
Cost/Student	28	8	(71%)
C Personal Service Contracts	374	0	
Cost/Student	<1	0	
E Goods and Services	83,299	121,177 3/	
Cost/Student	27	39	31%
G Travel	306	3,150	
Cost/Student	1	<1	
J Equipment	3,346	1,985	
Cost/Student	1	1	
L Employee Benefits	13,194	3,602	
Cost/Student	4	1	(75%)
Total	$188,541	$153,487	
Cost/Student	61	49	(20%)

1/ *WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS based on detailed data from two proxy colleges only.*

2/ *(_%) = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS lower by _%.*
_% = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS higher by _%.

3/ *Costs include $89,562 for rentals (leased facilities and rents for community classroons and meeting places) compared to average ($\bar{x}$) rental budget of $11,178 for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS.*

APPENDIX V.

Learning Resources Cost Breakdown

	WHATCOM 1/ WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITH-OUT CAMPUS	% Difference 2/
Annualized Headcount	3,110	2,474	
Code Category			
B Salaries & Wages	$69,110	$64,131	
Cost/Student	22	26	15%
C Personal Services Contract	6,226	0	
Cost/Student	2	0	
E Goods and Services	6,908	21,765	
Cost/Student	2	9	75%
G Travel	3,285	1,132	
Cost/Student	1	1	
J Equipment	16,917	57,092	
Cost/Student	5	23	76%
L Employee Benefits	2,600	9,076	
Cost/Student	1	4	79%
TOTAL	$105,045	$153,196	
Cost/Student	34	62	45%

1/ WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS based on detailed data from <u>two</u> proxy colleges only.
2/ (_%) = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS <u>lower</u> by _%.
_% = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS <u>higher</u> by _%.

APPENDIX VI.

Instruction Cost Breakdown

Part A-Instruction by Cost Category

	WHATCOM 1/ WITH CAMPUS	WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS	% Difference 2/
Annualized Headcount	3,110	2,474	
Code Category			
B Salaries & Wages	$1,036,808	$552,339	
Cost/Student	333	223	(33%)
C Personal Services Contract	21,012	1,550	
Cost/Student	7	1	(86%)
E Goods and Services	59,846	25,183	
Cost/Student	20	10	(50%)
G Travel	16,938	14,000	
Cost/Student	5	6	17%
J Equipment	45,134	25,437	
Cost/Student	15	10	(33%)
L Employee Benefits	108,156	50,869	
Cost/Student	35	21	(40%)
TOTAL	$1,284,669 3/	$669,378	
Cost/Student	413	271	(34%)

Part B-Number of Faculty Detail

Annualized FT Faculty	66	22	
Annualized PT Faculty	107	107	
Annualized Paraprofessionals	3	1	
Annualized Total Faculty	176	130	
Total Faculty:Student Ratio	1:18	1:19	

Part C-Clerical Cost Detail

Annual Salary for Clerical	48,503	67,349 4/	
Cost/Student	16	27	41%

1/ Figures for WHATCOM WITH CAMPUS based on detailed data from two proxy colleges only.

2/ (_%) = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS lower by _%.
_% = WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS higher by _%.

3/ Total for proxy includes transfer of funds ($\bar{x}$ = < $1/student) and cost for data processing at one proxy ($\bar{x}$ = < $1/student)

4/ Figure for clerical for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS presented here for comparison purposes only; this amount is actually budgeted under administration for WHATCOM WITHOUT CAMPUS. It does not include salary for coordinator or student help; nor does it include cost for employee benefits.

whatcom
community
college

5217 Northwest Road
Bellingham, WA 98225
Contact Person:
Lynne Mahlberg
676-2170 or 384-1541

FEATURE STORY
September, 1976

WCC LOOKS AT FIRST SIX YEARS

by Lynne Mahlberg

This month Whatcom Community College marks the first six years of its operation. Since opening its doors in 1970, this young and vigorous college has been blazing a new path, discovering and meeting many of the unmet educational needs of Whatcom County. If there were early doubts about the need for another college in this area, those reservations have long since been removed. Community response and enrollment figures attest to the high degree of acceptance experienced by the college during its short history.

Out of the turbulence and student unrest of the '60's has emerged this new "breed" of college. It is attracting students of all ages and needs, ranging from teenagers to octogenarians. These students often are highly motivated, intent on pursuing already determined goals.

At Whatcom, students include city dwellers, farmers, college transfer students, Lummi and Nooksack Indians, college graduates, veterans, persons working toward high school completion, the elderly, factory

workers, Mexican-Americans, foreign students, housewives, and people changing careers in mid-life. They all seek knowledge and skills, and opportunities for personal enrichment and fulfillment.

One hundred and thirty faculty instruct at Whatcom. The entire staff comprise almost 200 people who live and work in Whatcom County.

Meeting People Where They Are

An important concept held by staff at Whatcom is the idea of meeting people "where they are" in their life experience, capitalizing on the skills, abilities, interests and knowledge they have already accumulated. Staff, programs and resources available to students at Whatcom Community College are geared to meet individuals where they are when they come to Whatcom.

One of the ways in which Whatcom does this is through its individualized learning programs - programs based on the student's schedule rather than on that of the college, tailoring learning conditions and situations to the student's needs. These individual programs, many of which culminate in a two-year associate degree, allow students to pursue at their own pace and convenience the areas of learning and skills which are of the greatest interest to them.

Over 100 students at Whatcom now are pursuing their college educations by means of individual learning contracts.

Instructional Program Comprehensive

The instructional program at WCC is comprehensive. It includes a college transfer program, several state-approved vocational/occupational programs, and community service offerings.

Academic subjects covering the first two years of a college transfer program and leading to an Associate in Arts and Science degree are available. Many of Whatcom's students transfer to four-year colleges and universities. Follow up studies of Whatcom's students at four-year institutions indicate that their progress is equal to students beginning at the four-year schools.

Also available are a number of two-year vocational programs which on completion are awarded an Associate in Applied Arts degree. Some of these vocational programs are offered in cooperation with the Bellingham Vocational Technical Institute.

Then, too, community service courses and workshops are offered, many in cooperation with other agencies and institutions in the county - Whatcom Community College actively having sought cooperative agreements with existing institutions and school districts of Whatcom County in order to avoid needless and costly duplication of services.

One of Whatcom's major challenges has been to discover and to fill educational needs not already served by other institutions and agencies in Whatcom County.

(more)

For example, Whatcom offers a farm management program to help dairy farmers make the best use of their farms. Entire families are urged to take part in the program as a team. Visiting WCC instructors call at the 110 dairy farms involved in the program, go over the carefully recorded books, and give advice on increasing productivity.

Whatcom's instructional program also includes developmental offerings to help students eliminate educational deficiencies and to upgrade all levels of skills. Students (or any person in the community) may enroll and pursue their studies at their own pace, receiving individualized instruction in reading, writing and math as well as speaking and listening skills. Assistance is available at both beginning and advanced levels. Programs also are offered which help persons to develop self-awareness of personal, occupational and academic capabilities.

Trustees Decided on No-Campus Concept

"We do not expect to build a large central facility to which our clientele must come....we intend to accommodate people." was the bold statement made by the board of trustees back in 1968, two years before the college was operational.

Today, as from its beginning, Whatcom Community College is the only college in the Washington community college system of 27 colleges to be operating in a completely decentralized manner. It takes instruction to the diverse population of Whatcom County in both traditional and creative ways. In order to provide the optimum in services throughout the county,

a facilities plan was devised. The plan included a college service center (administrative offices), community instructional centers, a mobile unit and many individual classrooms throughout the county.

The college service center, a "relocatable" modular unit belonging to the state, is located on Northwest Road. Here administrative services are housed. Community instructional centers are located in Lynden, Bellingham, Ferndale, and the Lummi tribal center. These, and future centers called for in long-range plans, help to give the college an identity in the communities. They provide convenient locations for registration, counseling and advising services, and for certain special classes.

A mobile unit takes college services, classes and workshops to outlying areas. A large number of facilities already existing in the community comprise more than 150 "classrooms," which include civic buildings, grange halls, churches, other schools, and so on. These host the nearly 170 courses offered by the college.

A college delivery service makes twice- and sometimes thrice-daily runs between centers and classrooms, carrying needed supplies and equipment.

Is Decentralized Operation Valid?

Will Whatcom's way of delivering educational services prove feasible over the long haul?

This is exactly what administration and staff have set out to test. A new phase of activity began last year upon receipt of a $150,000 grant, awarded to the college by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. This amount is being matched by state funds. With these funds, Whatcom for a period of three years will attempt to demonstrate the validity of its decentralized style of operation. To be identified also are the operational costs generated by its style.

Having received full endorsement by the Washington State Board for Community College Education, WCC administrators feel the demonstration will show that quality education can successfully be delivered to a community in this manner. Educational leaders at state and national levels are viewing Whatcom's demonstration project with interest.

In 1975, Whatcom was invited to join an exclusive national organization composed of thirteen colleges which operate in innovative and decentralized modes.

Rapid Growth Shown

It is interesting to note the rate of growth of Whatcom Community College over its nearly six years of operation:

(more)

YEAR	HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENTS	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS (15 or more credit hours)	OPERATING BUDGET
1970-71	486	83	$104,744
1971-72	726	163	$367,182
1972-73	1,439	382	$532,991
1973-74	1,839	519	$765,533
1974-75	2,000	608	$1,093,750
1975-76	2,150	822	$1,512,500
1976-77	2,200	862	$1,675,439

WCC's Challenge

The challenge for Whatcom Community College, as with all educational institutions, is to remain flexible enough to change practice and expectations as the needs of its community change. This the board and administration intend to do. And to offer the highest possible quality of instruction and options for learning to those who enroll at its open doors.

-30-

internal

mandates

whatcom community college
5217 northwest road, bellingham, wa 98225
676-2170, 384-1541

Internal Mandates - External Influences

The Community College Act of 1967 gives both being and mission to our district. The mission, clearly stated, is to provide a comprehensive program with equal emphasis upon transfer courses, occupational education and community service - this latter to encompass educational, cultural and recreational programs. An open door policy is mandated.

Whatcom is a State school. The majority of its financial resources will be State appropriated. It will be the task of the trustees to provide stewardship - translating appropriations into operational budgets combining legislative intent with local needs.

Given the vagaries of the economy and political necessities, no absolute level of support can be predicted. Relatively, it is reasonable as a new school to expect that allocations will increase until Whatcom County residents are afforded statewide parity of service. Our systematic program evaluation and data accumulation should assist the achievement of that parity.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees
May 6, 1975

INTERNAL MANDATES

The Board of Trustees of Whatcom Community College remains excited about the opportunity to meet external mandates and local needs in both customary and creative ways. We are the newest of the State's districts, and we are still relatively unencumbered by continuing programs and methods that might be more responsive or that should be modified or cancelled. We are not foolish enough to imagine that all our ventures should be new, different or whatever "innovative" is - but we know there are many different ways to proceed in supplying services and programs. Our obligation is to meet the educational needs of the county; our goal is to proffer educational services throughout the county; our challenge is to adapt to the changing expectations of the county.

As an element of the flexibility this latter implies, we are committed to the concept of decentralized, area-wide operation in convenient, suitable facilities - borrowed when possible, rented when not. We will not acquire a large central campus.

In matching the instructional activity of the college to the varied needs and capabilities of the district we will strive for a balanced program - vocational, continuing education and transfer. Statistical equilibrium will not be sacrosanct.

As part of our commitment to serve the educational needs of our district, special effort will be directed to providing opportunity for:

The unemployed and underemployed who need vocational and occupational skills to find work, advance and become secure in their employment.

The migrant and seasonal workers who may need all of the above.

The veterans of military service who are building or rebuilding their lives.

The Indian members of our community who may be any or all of the above.

The elderly who may be unaware of vocational and health programs available to them.

The late starter - potential transfer students who did not include college entrance requirements among their high school goals.

The wage earner whose search for cultural enrichment must be undertaken at other than regular work-week hours.

The women who may be in several of the previous categories or those simply questioning the relevancy of further education to them.

We must employ staff who are open to uncommon modes of instruction and learning, independent study, individual study, programmed study, use of radio and television, challenge tests or performances, variable (comparative) class sizes even for the same subject or activity, and so on. These are "uncommon" only in that they are usually peripheral to a college's instructional approach. We want to consider them as central wherever possible. This implies careful selection and in-service training of faculty. It also implies temporary faculty until those who will be comfortable in these circumstances are identified. Staff leadership is indispensable. Staff is the key to our success and service. We must, compatible with our decentralization, provide them the resources and opportunities to utilize their abilities. Professionals expect to work cooperatively and openly. We must facilitate this. Staff members should be involved specifically in matters relating to their assignment and area of expertise.

We must maintain with the chief administrator an amicable but clearly defined dichotomy. Policy making is a Board obligation and erosion of this function shall be carefully guarded against. Just as zealously, we will refrain from infringement upon the prerogatives of the administrator. We will expect full cooperation between our two spheres.

Whatcom Community College is committed to cooperation with other existing agencies. We will avoid wherever possible, duplication of facilities and programs. If a need can be served by assisting an appropriate program we will assist and not parallel that program. This option we will consider before undertaking <u>any</u> effort.

Whatcom Community College is convinced of the need for long-range planning and emphasis upon evaluation. Such should be routine practice for any organization; it is especially important for us. The Board of Trustees must review this planning regularly and critically and provide constructive suggestions for improvement.

Evaluation procedures must be a part of the main thrust of the college. Cost efficiency and alternative decisions, shift of priorities or programs, staffing, maintenance - these and other elements of our operation demand rational decisions, and such decisions require continual evaluation.

Creativity and innovation do not have to be unsystematic. Indeed, they cannot be because of external requirements - legislative to name but one. The development and refinement of evaluation procedures is the task of the chief administrator and his staff. So, too, is its implementation. The trustees have agreed to an annual assessment of their own performance as an indication of the importance they place upon evaluation.

how a

COLLEGE WITHOUT A CAMPUS

plans to house its services

whatcom
community college

November 8, 1972

The Development of Facilities for Whatcom Community College

The Trustees of the college have stated clearly their mandate regarding the manner in which the college shall develop its facilities.

> "We have committed ourselves to a decentralized operation...we do not expect to build a large central facility to which our clientele must come...we expect to borrow suitable facilities when we can and in places where they are convenient to our students. If we can't borrow, we expect to rent. If we can't rent, we expect to lease. If we can't lease, we expect to rebuild existing facilities...we may have central locations for administrative purposes and for certain fixed requirements...but these will be the lesser part of our campus... subcampuses in permanent locations throughout the county are preferable to a central campus even of modest dimensions."

The related external mandate of the state system of community colleges is the goal of the "open door." The goal of the "open door" which seeks to reduce or eliminate the geographic, social, financial, academic and other barriers to access will be served at Whatcom Community College by bringing instruction into the various communities as suggested by the Trustees rather than seeking to draw people to a central campus. This will make day classes and summer classes as accessible as evening classes to students in the scattered communities of the county.

Types of facilities

The commitment of the college can be carried out by the development and use of four types of facilities; a college service center, a number of community study centers, mobile units, and a large number of individual rentals.

A. College Service Center: This facility would be a geographically central unit designed and owned by the college to house the services necessary to support the instructional services* carried on away from this center. The list of functions performed here would include the following:

- general administrative services
- the business and financial services

---

* The organization of Whatcom Community College assumes that student services are an integral part of Instruction.

- the Dean of Instruction's office functions of general administration of the instructional program
- the general administration of the student personnel services function
- the central processing and distribution point for the Learning Resources Center functions
- instructional materials production
- media development and support services
- central secretarial services for administration, instruction and student services
- the depot for the college car pool

The area adjacent to the county library facility on Northwest Road has been selected as best serving this need. It is geographically suited to serve the rest of the county and the college is committed to a cooperative effort with the county library. There are a number of ways in which the college and the library might be more cooperative to our mutual benefit and being close to one another will facilitate that cooperation.

The establishment of this center will come about in at least two phases. The first will be the creation of a temporary center of relocatable buildings acquired from the state system's pool. This will give us an opportunity to experiment with the center and its functions without the commitment of permanent construction. The final phase will be the construction of permanent facilities to house the service center. The time between the two phases is likely to be a period of three to five years. The college has already received favorable action by the Ferndale School District Board for the use of property on the north side of the county library for the first phase.

B. Community Instructional Centers: The major portion of Instruction will be carried out in a number of community-based centers around the county. These centers will evolve into permanent sites as experience tells us where we can best serve our clientele.

There are a number of distinct communities within the county including the Lummi Reservation which should be considered population centers for our purposes. The functions to be carried out in these centers would include the following:

- classroom instruction
- counseling and advising
- registration
- faculty/student conferences
- a large variety of community services
- student study facilities
- computer assisted instruction
- student use of TV and radio assisted instruction
- reception and service points for library and learning resource services
- town hall activities for student involvement in the development of the contact points for administration and students.

These centers will vary from community to community in the types of services housed and the type of facilities utilized. In some places facilities will be developed adjacent to high schools in order to take advantage of the use of those facilities. In other places other considerations will dictate the location. These community centers will be developed in existing facilities for the most part. These facilities might be augmented by the use of relocatables from the state system pool and college-owned mobile facilities. It seems unlikely that there is a community to be served by the college which does not have available many suitable spaces for our use.

C. Mobile Component: The college needs to develop the capacity to take certain of our functions to the clientele of the district by the use of mobilized units. Technological developments have made it possible to install almost any instructional or student service function in a mobilized unit.

Such units could serve well in cases where some functions were needed for a short period of time or periodically, and in cases where the facility is of a specialized type such as a laboratory and the cost would be prohibitive to establish in a number of places. Such a facility would allow the college to test out the attraction of certain activities in places remote to the established centers with a minimal investment. Functions to be carried out in this manner would include the following:

- counseling, advising and registration
- specialized instruction
- laboratory instruction

D. Single unit rental spaces: There will always be a need for renting space for single courses. This will allow the college to disperse its activities even more widely around the county than will be possible with the community study centers. Spaces such as this will be rented because of a need for some type of specialized facility or equipment, because a particular location is needed, or because the community centers will not accommodate the numbers of students or classes.

Planning

The experience of the college thus far indicates that our activities will develop in scope and volume ahead of our planning and development of facilities. Though this is inconvenient for both clients and staff there is an important advantage. We are able and will be able to experiment with the various types of facilities and locations which we feel we need. For instance, the need to "make do" with inadequate office space allows us to try out some of the operational components of the "open space" office concept and to establish the working relationships which we feel will best serve us without having to be concerned with traditional arrangements.

Our operational style and facilities development is already causing stress with the state system formulas for funding. For example, travel is going to be inordinately high as compared to conventional operating modes. However, if the operation is going to be physically decentralized then staff is going to have to travel. Delivery systems will be costly as we provide services to widely dispersed centers of activity. The college is counting on the cooperation of the rest of the community college system in working out "trade-offs" in the operating formula and payments in lieu of construction funds for activites carried on as a consequence of not building a conventional campus. Where necessary we will strive for a change in the law to accommodate our style of operation.

A Challenge

The problems attendant to the development of facilities to match this commitment are considerable; however, one possibly more difficult than others to solve involves the matter of identification for staff and students. The campus as a physical object is such a strong symbol in the history of higher education that very direct steps will have to be taken to create other symbols and other rallying points for professional and student identification. Our proposed mode of operation will also weaken the support which staff and students normally get from physical association with a number of their peers. Hopefully, traditional symbols will be replaced with less tangible substitutes. When we are successful we will have created a dynamic climate in which the idea of a learning community can flourish--a community as large as Whatcom County.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
JAN 7 1977
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES